Reply to Office Action of 10/13/2009

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 13, 2009, has been received and reviewed.

Each of claims 1-5 and 7-11 stands rejected. Claims 1 and 8-11 have been canceled. Claim 46

has been added. Claims 2-5 and 7 have been amended herein. Care has been exercised to

introduce no new subject matter. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of

the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for pointing out allowable subject

matter in new independent claim 46.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed

invention is ostensibly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 and 8-11 have been

canceled, rendering rejection of the claims moot. Applicants respectfully submit that new

independent claim 46 comprises statutory subject matter. Further, Applicants respectfully

submit that claims 2-5, and 7 depend from independent claim 46 and, as such, are patentable for

at least the reasons discussed below.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102, because they were

ostensibly anticipated by Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 5,664,109, hereinafter "Johnson"). Claims 1

and 8-11 have been canceled, rendering rejection of the claims moot. Further, new independent

claim 46 is patentable over Johnson. In particular, independent claim 46 provides a method to

automatically generate a data structure comprising possible joins on an existing data table. As

Page 6 of 8 3768907 v1

Application No. 10/665,560 Response Filed: 12/04/2009

Reply to Office Action of 10/13/2009

such, when new data is entered, data is entered into the corresponding data table. Further, the

metadata structure is also automatically populated in anticipation of any future joins. As noted

by the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, this compilation of features is not

taught in Johnson.

As such, independent claim 46 is patentable over Johnson. Further, dependent

claims 2-5 and 7 have been amended to depend from independent claim 46. As such, dependent

claims 2-5 and 7 are patentable over Johnson for at least reasons given above. Accordingly,

claims 2-5, 7, and 46 are patentable over Johnson.

3768907 v1 Page 7 of 8

## **CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 2-5, 7, and 46 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or kadsmith@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Kristin D. Smith /

Kristin D. Smith Reg. No. 63,545

KSS/rls SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. 2555 Grand Blvd. Kansas City, MO 64108-2613 816-474-6550

3768907 v1 Page 8 of 8